



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,818	05/30/2001	Young-Jun Yoon	POU920000086US1	6631

7590 03/15/2004
William Kinnaman, Jr.
IBM Corporation,
Intellectual Property Law Department
2455 South Road, M/S P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,818

Applicant(s)

YOON, YOUNG-JUN

Examiner

Susan F. Rayyan

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 June 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.
2. Information disclosure statement filed June 3, 2003 has been received and all documents were considered except for Japanese 11-203153 as an English translation was not provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 7-8, 15-16, 23-24 recites the limitation "said browser-specific". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Specification

5. This application contains an appendix. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.96(c), a computer program listing in an appendix must contain only code. (See MPEP 608.05). Accordingly, applicant is required to cancel appendix in the specification, and incorporate this documentation in a drawing in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 (identifying each page as a separate figure), or insert the document in the descriptive portion of the detailed specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2177

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5,7,12-13,15,20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson (Pub. No. US 2002/0087667).

As per claims 1,12, 20 Anderson anticipates:

A hypertext browser for retrieving data from a selected one of a plurality of databases at fig. 13-14;

a plurality of browser components, each of which is operable to retrieve data from a corresponding one of said databases at paragraph 34 and page 5, paragraph 43;

means for receiving a hypertext request from a requester specifying data contained in one of said databases fig 8;

means responsive to receiving said request for directing said request to the browser component corresponding to said one of said databases to permit said browser component to retrieve the data specified in said request paragraph 43, lines 3-8.

Anderson teaches a plurality of browser components, each of which is operable to retrieve data from a corresponding one of said databases, means for receiving a hypertext request from a requester specifying data contained in one of said databases, and means responsive to receiving said request for directing said request to the browser component corresponding to said one of said databases to permit said browser

Art Unit: 2177

component to retrieve the data specified in said request at paragraph 34, page 5, paragraph 43, and figs.8, 13-14.

As per claims 2,13,21 same as claim arguments above and Anderson anticipates:

said request specifies one of said browser components, said means responsive to receiving said request directing said request to the browser component specified in said request at p.5, paragraph 43.

As per claims 3,22 same as claim arguments above and Anderson anticipates: said means responsive to said request generates a common portion of a hypertext reply to said requester at paragraph 34, lines 4-9.

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Anderson anticipates: which said common portion comprises a header portion at fig.9.

As per claims 5 same as claim arguments above and Anderson anticipates: said common portion comprises a footer portion at fig. 9.

As per claims 7,15,23 same as claim arguments above and Anderson anticipates:

each of said browser components has a translator component associated therewith, said translator component intermediating between said browser component and said database and generating a request- specific portion of said browser-specific portion of said hypertext reply to said requester at paragraph 43, lines 3-8.

Art Unit: 2177

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 6,8,14, 16,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (Pub. No. US 2002/0087667) in view of Borecki et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0016749).**

As per claims 6,14 same as claim arguments above and Anderson does not explicitly teach each of said browser components generates a browser-specific portion of a hypertext reply to said requester however Borecki does teach this limitation at page 4, paragraph 52 and fig. 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to provide a means to select an item for purchase (paragraph 53, line 3).

As per claims 8,16,24 same as claim arguments above and Anderson does not explicitly teach said browser component generates a non-request-specific portion of said browser-specific portion of said hypertext reply to said requester however Borecki does teach this limitation at page 4, paragraph 52 and fig. 8 (note: bottom left window "Featured Listings" would be a non-request –specific portion). It would have been

Art Unit: 2177

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to provide a means to select an item for purchase (paragraph 53, line 3).

10. Claims 9,17,25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (Pub. No. US 2002/0087667) in view of Eager et al. (US 5,960,200).

As per claims 9,17,25 same as claim arguments above and Anderson does not explicitly teach one of said databases comprises an interface repository however Eager does teach this limitation at col. 24, lines 10-11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to develop software.

11. Claims 10,18,26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (Pub. No. US 2002/0087667) in view of Frey et al (Pub. No.: US 2004/0019898).

As per claims 10,18,26 same as claim arguments above and Anderson does not explicitly teach one of said databases stores naming contexts however Frey does teach this limitation at p. 17, paragraph 228. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to develop software.

12. Claims 11,19,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (Pub. No. US 2002/0087667) in view of in view of Herrendoerfer et al. (US 6,473,759).

Art Unit: 2177

As per claims 11,19,27 same as claim arguments above and Anderson does not explicitly teach one of said databases stores Java classes however Herrendoerfer does teach this limitation at col.2, lines 38-39. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to develop software.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (703) 305-0311. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for Official communications, (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications and (703) 746-7240 for Status inquiries and draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Susan Rayyan



March 7, 2004



PAMELA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER